

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated March 23, 2009 has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 1, 7-9, 10, 11, 46, 47, 51, 59 and 63 have been amended. Claims 67-71 have been added. Support for the amendments and new claims may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

**Objection to Claims**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claim 58 is objected to because Applicant inadvertently included the text of the cancelled claim in the previously submitted Response. Applicants have submitted herewith a new claim listing, omitting the text of cancelled claim 58. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 59 and 63 were objected to because of a typographical error. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy and attention in identifying the error. Claims 59 and 63 have been amended to correct the typographical error. Accordingly the withdrawal of the objection to claims 59 and 63 is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph Rejection of Claim 2**

At page 3 of the Office Action, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph due to a typographical error. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy and attention in identifying the error. Claim 2 has been amended to correct the typographical error. Accordingly the withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

**Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-10, 13, 46-54, 57 and 59-66**

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 13, 46-54, 57 and 59-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 7,280,566) in view of Gentry (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,951).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “generating a database based on parsing the second packet, the database comprising first information indicating a first property associated with the first data stream and second information different from the first indicating a second property associated with the first data stream.” Thus, claim 1 provides for generating a database having different information indicative of different properties of the first data stream. According to the Office Action at page 5, Okamoto discloses a database at col. 25, line 59 through column 26, line 58. However, the cited portion of Okamoto discloses only that a format identifier for a data stream can be stored in a table. *Okamoto*, col. 26, lines 54-56. Okamoto does not disclose storing first and second information property information for a received data stream. Accordingly, Okamoto and Gentry, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited elements of claim 1.

With respect to claim 46, the claim has been amended to recite “a memory configured to store a database based on parsing the second packet, the database comprising first information indicating a first property associated with the first data stream and second information different from the first indicating a second property associated with the first data stream, the second property different from the first.” For reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, the cited references fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited elements of claim 46.

Claims 2-10 and 13 depend from claim 1. Claims 47-54 and 57 depend from claim 46. Accordingly, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least one element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 1 and 46. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 1-10, 13, 14, 46-54, 57, and 58 and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**Obviousness Rejection of Claims 11-12 and 55-56**

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 11-12 and 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Gentry, and in further view of the examiner's official notice.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1, while claims 55 and 56 depend from claim 46. As explained above, Okamoto and Gentry do not disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 1 and 46. Further, the Official Notice taken by the Office does not remedy the deficiencies of the other cited references. Accordingly, the cited art does not disclose or suggest at least one element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 1 and 46. Further, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 11, 12, 55 and 56 and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 67-71**

Claims 67-71 have been added, and recite features not disclosed by the cited references. For example, Claim 67 recites "storing a first set of descriptors based on processing the first packet in a first database, a first descriptor of the first set of descriptors identifying a first property of the first data stream and a second descriptor of the first set of descriptors identifying a second property of the data stream." These features are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited references. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of claims 67-71 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 01-0365.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan/  
Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146  
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL & POLANSKY, LLP  
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200  
Austin, Texas 78730  
(512) 439-7100 (phone)  
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

June 18, 2009  
Date